

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Historic Preservation Commission Site Visit**  
**Jess and Lizzy Purtymun House – HP Survey #139**  
**Monday, June 23, 2014 – 8:30 a.m.**  
**Community Development Lobby, Building 104 – Sedona City Hall**  
**102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, Arizona 86336**

**Purpose:** To give members of the Historic Preservation Commission an opportunity to conduct a site visit regarding the present condition and structural integrity of the Jess and Lizzy Purtymun House, HP Survey #139, and its setting and contextual area on the Lomacasi property.

**Meeting Place:** Lobby of Community & Economic Development Department, Building 104, located at 102 Roadrunner Drive, Building 104, Sedona, AZ, 86336, to proceed to 800 N. S.R. 89A (Lomacasi Lane).

**Special Note:** The Commission has been invited to walk the subject property. It is strongly advised that appropriate shoes and clothes, etc., be worn for walking on uneven terrain.

- 1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order and Roll Call. The Commission and staff will then carpool to the site of the Jess and Lizzy Purtymun House located at 800 N. State Route 89A (Lomacasi Lane).**

Chair Unger verified proper notice of the site visit at 8:40 a.m.

**Roll Call:**

**Commissioners Present:** Chair Brynn Burkee Unger, Vice Chair Ann Jarmusch and Commissioners Catherine Coté, Allyson Holmes and Charlie Schudson. Commissioner Steve Segner arrived at the Lomacasi site at 9:56 a.m. Commissioner Jane Grams was excused.

**Staff Present:** Cynthia Lovely and Cari Meyer

**Council Liaison Present:** Dan McIlroy

*Note: The meeting was recessed at approximately 8:42 a.m. to carpool to 800 N. State Route 89A (Lomacasi Lane).*

- 2. Discussion on a site inspection at 800 N. S.R. 89A (Lomacasi Lane) regarding the present condition of the historic structure, setting and contextual area on the Lomacasi property.**

*The Commission arrived at the site at approximately 8:57 a.m.*

Cari Meyer explained that the property is currently zoned for 19 lodging units. The current property owner does not know what they want to do, but we are here to look at the historic building on the site, so they will know how the Commission would want that building to be treated as they go forward.

Councilor McIlroy asked if the Commission is to determine whether or not the Purtymun cabin can be saved or allowed to be demolished. Cynthia Lovely indicated that the Commission should come up with the Commission's recommendation to the Planning & Zoning Commission, and you have the Nancy Burgess's report from the last meeting. The Chair noted that they also have the packet and Kathy Levin's history of it; however, the Commission is just viewing this today in light of what might happen in the future, so we can make a more educated decision regarding whether or not it is something to be saved.

### **Commission's Comments, Questions and Concerns:**

- Question regarding the number of acres on the property, and Cari indicated that she wasn't sure, but it previously was used for a number of cabins that were used as short-term vacation rentals. It is a larger property than other 19-unit hotels in the City, but a lot of it is in the floodplain and it is in a Lodging zone, so they have some commercial rights and the ability to have 19 short-term rentals. That is not to say that they will keep the cabins, but they retain the right to have 19 lodging units.
- Question as to who owns the property. Cari Meyer indicated that a retail development had been proposed, but that development didn't work out and it went back to the Steele Foundation who had purchased the property as a non-profit. They are a non-profit out of Phoenix. Cynthia added that they are mostly a philanthropic organization and they are not the sole owners.
- Comment that at this stage, we aren't looking at what is going to happen with this property, other than looking at the Purtymun Cabin and its context.
- Question about what triggered the Commission's interest in this property. Cari explained it was interest on the part of the developer in determining the possibilities. The Commission would review any development application, because of the historic structure on the property, but for their planning, they want an idea ahead of time.
- Question as to if a recommendation is made, who it goes to. Cari explained it would be part of their development application, so it would depend on their proposal as to if it would just go to the Planning & Zoning Commission or be forwarded on to the City Council.

The Commission then continued the walk to the Purtymun cabin, and Cari pointed out part of the Owenby Ditch. Chair Unger added that it is a part of the Owenby Ditch that is not landmarked.

- Question as to if the Commission came to the conclusion that it should be preserved as an historic landmark, does that carry ultimate weight. The Chair explained that it really depends on the City and Planning & Zoning, because it is not landmarked and we can't dictate; we don't have total control over it. We can make recommendations at this point, but we can't make demands, because it isn't landmarked.
- Request for some of the history.

Chair Unger read the following that was written in 2005:

"The Historic Preservation Commission feels that this structure is very significant and strong efforts should be made to preserve it on the Lomacasi property. According to the results of the City's Historic Resource Survey of 2001, the Purtymun house was identified as a property potentially eligible for the National Register under Criterion C - it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction, and perhaps under Criterion A - association with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. This list was approved by the State Historic Preservation Office.

Criterion C: The Purtymun house is very typical in form to the simple vernacular houses built around Sedona in its first 75 years or so. It is an example of a folk-style residential architecture. The size, inside ceiling heights, gable roof, and front porch are all to be expected for the 1920s in Sedona. The house is also typical of most surviving historic Sedona buildings in that it has evolved over its 80-some years. Built in 1924, the fireplace was added by the Purtymun's son, Bud, in the mid-1940s and the rock veneer was added in the late 1950s by a subsequent owner."

Although the house's original siding and porch were of wood, the later rock work is of all locally quarried native sandstone, very typical in style and application, and now just at 50 years itself. The Purtymun's saw this house as 'modern' and the vernacular wood easement windows seem to be original and may have been handmade in this 'modern' configuration.

The Purtymun house is also important in that it retains an important setting adjacent to Oak Creek. Although the other historic out-buildings are long gone, several native red rock and river rock retaining walls remain that were hand built by Jess Purtymun.

Criterion A: In addition, the Purtymun family is closely tied to the homesteading and agricultural historical themes of Sedona development. They also played a significant role in the building of several primary roads and bridges in and out of Sedona, thus aligning the Purtymun name with the also important historical transportation theme associated with Sedona settlement.

In addition to the criteria identified by the SHPO, the HPC feels that the home also qualifies under Criterion B - . . . associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.

Criterion B: The Purtymun family was the fourth permanent family to arrive in Oak Creek and stay, with descendants still living in the canyon today. All the family's generations have contributed to Sedona's development and quality of life. Jess Purtymun initiated a petition to the County Commission in Flagstaff to obtain funds for building local roads, and then was a foreman of Coconino County road building crews, gathered supplies and equipment, and finished the building projects that would make a difference in the lives of the pioneers. He also worked with a number of people in building the Assembly of God Church and parsonage, and other buildings and structures in the area.

In light of the above, the HP Commission feels that this property should be given strong consideration to being preserved as Sedona's Historic Landmark and sensitively integrated into any relationship with the Oak Creek. We think it is important it be preserved on the Lomacasi property, but because it no longer has any relationship to its missing agricultural out-buildings, we can envision that the house could be moved to another location on the site to better accommodate new structures for the owner."

Chair Unger indicated that there is a tape of one of the Purtymun's explaining having grown up in this house, and that was an interview with Bud Purtymun, youngest son of Jess and Lizzie Purtymun on October 5, 2005, and it was done by Kathy Levin and Janeen Trevillyan.

- Question about what has happened in the last 8½ years. Chair Unger indicated that there was a development that requested a Zone Change to build retail space here and a hotel, and the HPC had a meeting about this structure and decided they could move it.
- Comment that the question is in the context of where it is, and is it appropriate. We are looking at the condition of the building and whether or not it is historically appropriate to argue for its continuance, and consider the context of the area around it.
- Concern expressed about it being moved with the stone on it, so to consider that, we would need a better understanding of whether or not that could be done.
- Comment about the porch; there is a stone-raised porch, so how do you move it?
- Question as to why anyone would want to move it from its original location, if such a move could be avoided.
- Comment that there is a concern that it is deteriorated in such a way that it is no longer valid, so we need to look at it and make arguments, once we have seen what it looks like.
- Comment that there is a longer history that Nancy Burgess may have included. Cynthia Lovely pointed out that Nancy wrote a letter just in time for your last meeting.
- Question as to if it has yet to be landmarked, and the Chair indicated that the property owners do not want to landmark it.
- Comment that property owners basically can not maintain properties, so they are then forced to be destroyed because of deterioration.
- Comment that it was important 8½ years ago, but today, because it is so rundown, it may no longer be valid.

- Comment that how much it has deteriorated since then is not known. It is boarded up and we don't know what the inside looks like, but we won't be able to go inside, so it isn't known if we can make a judgment as to if it is any more deteriorated than it was. The roof has deteriorated certainly and that can mean all sorts of damage to the integrity of the property.
- Question as to if we are looking at the status, because a non-profit foundation that owns the property has made an inquiry to give them some feedback, so they know their options, and the Chair indicated yes, at this point.
- Question as to if 'valid' means the building is valid or the judgment that you just read is valid. The Chair clarified that the Commission has to decide whether or not the history, context and architectural structure of the building is significant enough, in addition to the human element of who lived there. We look at all of those things when we are judging whether or not something is significant enough to try to save, and that is what the 'valid' means.
- Question about the property owners not wanting to designate this.
- Comment that whether or not the current property owners were approached is not known. Cari Meyer explained that the previous project did not save it. Those property owners no longer have the property, and the current property owners have asked HPC to look at it and let them know what you think, so they can make a decision as they develop their plans.
- Question about if they choose not to request a designation, can the Commission, on its own motion, move a designation, and the Chair stated no. There are areas in the United States where that is done, but it doesn't happen in Arizona.
- Comment that we are here to see if it should be saved, but there has been no request for designation, so where does the City Council or Planning & Zoning have power to say you can't destroy the building if it is not designated. The Chair explained that the Commission doesn't have the power to say that. Generally, the Commission doesn't know what they are thinking of doing in the future. If they want to develop it the way the former developers did, they would have to have a Zone Change, and then the City can leverage that it can't go anywhere. It is not really a leverage that we can just say no, but if we have something on the survey, they come to the HPC and request recommendations, and we have 250-some properties on the survey, so there will be more instances than this one. We are also looking at the integrity, and it is difficult to understand the integrity without being able to go inside. We are hoping the new survey will identify some of the homes where the integrity is gone too much, because it is collapsing, etc.

Cynthia Lovely indicated that she though the Commission had already read Nancy Burgess's report, and if not, they really do need to read that report, because she put a lot of time and effort into consulting with architectural historians about it, so it is pretty thorough.

- Comment that it sounds like the Commission is being asked for an advisory opinion. One opinion might be to say that it is so deteriorated that there is nothing that can be preserved, so do what you are anticipating doing, and at the other extreme, the opinion might be that it is structurally sound and the history is so important that we implore you to preserve it and incorporate its preservation into your plans going forward, and there would be lots of things in-between.
- Question as to if the rendering of such advisory opinions is within our jurisdiction, and Chair Unger indicated yes.
- Comment that it behooves the Commission to sort out as much as we can, and then bring whatever force of persuasion we can to our opinion.
- Comment that a copy of Nancy Burgess's report is in the car. Cynthia Lovely requested that the report be provided, because Nancy was paid to do the report.

*Note: Commissioner Jarmusch and Cynthia Lovely went to get the report referenced at this time.*

- Comment that we are here at the request of the property owners, yet they won't let us inside. Chair Unger explained that there is a legitimate reason; there are safety issues and they have had so many squatters living in that building and the out buildings that they are afraid that if

something happened, it could be a liability issue, and she doesn't think that Nancy Burgess was able to get inside either. This structure has been on our most endangered list the past 7 years.

- Comment that one of the properties that won an award for restoration this year at the conference showed a 'before' picture that had no roof, basically a shell, and the owners redid it, but they put that much money into it, because it was important, and this structure is important just by the 'person' association. This is the beginning of Sedona and why the pioneers came here and established Oak Creek Canyon. It grieves her that this property is left to ruin, so she questions whether or not the integrity of the structure is critical, because of the importance in losing one of the last structures for those first families that made Sedona.
- Comment that today the Commission is just seeing this property and that the decision will come in the next Commission meeting. This is not the time to make a decision. Cari explained that this is so when it is on the agenda, you will have that visual of the building and the context, so we can walk around it together.
- Comment that at the meeting, it was easy to dismiss their property without having seen it. As we go forward, we shouldn't be making decisions without visiting the homes, because you can't get the context, etc., unless we see them. Even the photograph doesn't give you the feel of it, unless you see it.
- Comment recalling that the telegraph station that was a movie set is being restored, because it represented an architectural building, and this is the real thing, not a movie set, so this should be preserved as historical Sedona.
- Comment that certainly Nancy Burgess had an opinion about this property, and Nancy is doing an incredible amount of work, but whatever she says doesn't have to be exactly how we feel about it either. We have made decisions outside of the rulings, although whatever Nancy does, she generally is spot on about everything. Nancy was on the Prescott Historic Preservation Commission and is an historian. She has helped write all of our landmark applications for the Federal Government. Nancy was retained to evaluate as many of the places in the survey as she can by the end of the month.

*Note: Cynthia Lovely returned with the report.*

- Question about the source of the water. Cari indicated that it is part of the Owenby Ditch and it is not fully sealed; the ditch branches off of the creek.

*Note: Commissioner Jarmusch rejoined the group.*

Chair Unger read the following part of Nancy Burgess's report.

"Condition: The Purtymun house is currently vacant and boarded up. The exterior condition is good, except for the hole which was cut through the south wall for the installation of an air conditioner, which has since been removed. The roof is in very poor condition and needs to be stripped and sheeted if needed, and reroofed with a suitable material. The interior is not accessible.

Integrity: Clearly, the appearance and materials of the Purtymun house have changed since its construction in 1924. If the additions, changes to the exterior and roof materials and changes to the porch and the setting (primarily the addition of numerous buildings for the purpose of guest lodging) had occurred within the last 50 years, the building would not be considered to have historic integrity under the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines or the National Register criteria. However, the alterations to the house itself were completed more than 50 years ago and, therefore, have historic integrity in their own right. The house was previously deemed eligible for the National Register by the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office. Elements of the setting which have survived are the stone walls throughout the property which were primarily built by Jess and Elmer Purtymun, some were built by others at other times, and the segment of the Owenby Ditch which is extant on the property. There are four significant changes to the setting: (1) the demolition of numerous buildings which were on the property at the time of the Purtymun's residence, including a barn, storage buildings, two chicken houses and other

dwelling units, although some of these buildings may survive, (2) the addition of at least ten other buildings on the property.. .

Chair Unger indicated that when talking about the integrity of the property, we can look at it as a whole property, which would include all of the other buildings, and they probably have no integrity as far as historic preservation, and Nancy considered the whole property. We are isolating the part of the property that contains that building, and it may go down to the creek. We aren't trying to justify that the out buildings are historic. Nancy does talk about some of the walls being historic, but she is saying that she doesn't know which ones.

The Chair then indicated that the Commission can decide that what Nancy says is not something that we want to pursue, even if she was hired to do this; however, Nancy's understanding of all of these things is so great that is why she was hired to do this.

Chair Unger then continued to read the following from Nancy Burgess's Report:

"In conclusion, it is my recommendation that more research needs to be completed in order to definitely determine the age, construction techniques, stability and historic integrity of the 16 buildings on the Lomacasi property before any further plans for development are forthcoming. This research would give the City of Sedona much better information about what is on the property and a much stronger position in its efforts to retain any of the buildings on the property, including the Purtymun house, as the property is developed. Staff may be able to obtain further information from Coconino County records, although, since the property was located in the county until it was included in the incorporation of the City of Sedona, no building permits would have been required, so specific dates may not be available."

Chair Unger explained that while Nancy is including all of the buildings, today the Commission is really only considering the Purtymun house. Councilor McIlroy asked to see all of the buildings. The Commission then proceeded to walk around the Purtymun house.

- Comment that we might be able to look at the interview with Bud Purtymun later.
- Comment that the porch seems to be in surprisingly good condition.
- Comment that it is a pretty porch.
- Question as to if the report cites the roof was not in good shape, and the Chair indicated yes.
- Comment that from above, it is pretty bad; it needs replacing.
- Comment that the porch is great; there is no rot in the wood trim and the stone looks good.
- Comment that Commissioner Segner could eyeball this and tell us which end is up.
- Comment that we don't know if it has gotten wet inside. Cari noted that as the Historic Preservation Commission, the inside can be worked on without . . .
- Comment agreeing that they can do anything to the inside; that is not critical. The question would be whether or not the structure has deteriorated 2x4s, because of the water. Cynthia Lovely indicated that if you walk to where the air conditioning was, it is like a cross-section and you can see the original construction, then they added the stone over the top.
- Comment that it has no 2x4s; it is two pieces of 1x material that they put together; it is an amazing structure.
- Comment about getting confused with other red rock houses, so it is good that we are looking at the construction.
- Question as to if it is the quality of the wood used in those days; there are newer houses with more wood rot than this one. This wood looks surprisingly good.
- Comment about metal pieces, and the Chair explained that it would have been panels of tin siding that they made look like brick.
- Comment that there is a win-win potential.
- Comment that there doesn't seem to be holes, etc., that would cause significant damage in this part of the roof.
- Comment about one part of the roof that is the most damaged.

- Comment that the exterior shell appears to be in really good condition, unless something is being missed.
- Comment expressing agreement.
- Comment that Nancy Burgess seems to be right; it is the roof on that side, while this side isn't so bad.
- Comment that there aren't any problems with the mortar; no cracks.
- Comment that it doesn't look much different from the last time she was here.
- Comment that the fireplace looks like it is settling and separated, so there is probably water intrusion there.
- Comment that the basic structure of the house seems very solid; built like a fortress.
- Comment recalling that the prior developer thought it was in really bad shape and they needed to get rid of it.
- Comment that to them it is just an old building and they are looking at a bottom line cost to turn it into something useful for their development plans, but hopefully, there is a way.
- Comment indicating that they had agreed to move it, which she questions being able to do, but they were going to make it like an information center.
- Comment that looking at it in the context of its setting, it is sort of off center from the rest of the property, so they could do a park. It is floodplain right over this edge. Cari Meyer explained that the strip where you see the houses is out of the floodplain. There is a very large floodplain in this area.
- Question as to if the Purtymun house is in the floodplain, and Cari indicated that she didn't believe so, but staff can check.
- Comment that it may be one of the issues for potential development if the house is sitting on the largest section of developable land.
- Question as to if the Commission noticed the stone walls that the Purtymun's built, and the Chair indicated that they are wonderful.

*Note: It was noted that Commissioner Schudson had left the group.*

- Question about when this was abandoned as a hospitality business, and the Chair indicated was that it is in the letter that Nancy Burgess prepared.
- Comment that it may have been in 2002.

Cari Meyer summarized that the questions to research are the floodplain issues and when Lomacasi closed.

- Question as to if there is an ALTA survey of the property. Cari indicated that there should have been something with the last development.
- Comment that it would be interesting to see that for the perspective of where the house is located and how the preservation of it impacts the ability to develop the property, and how the Commission's decision would impact the property values.
- Comment that the other consideration is the access to the creek and highway; that is not in our purview, but it is something that is always going to be there, because it is hard to get into and back out.
- Comment that things like that can be changed. Cari explained that the previous development plan had basically built like an off ramp from S.R. 89A and instead of coming down like we did, it was more gradual.

*Note: It was noted that Councilor McIlroy left the group to find Commissioner Schudson.*

- Question about having access to the interior.
- Comment that the owners are probably going to want to be here when we do that. Cari Meyer asked the possibility of having them provided a report from someone.
- Comment that the interest is to have someone from the Commission or staff see it.

- Comment that looking at the other stuff is not related to preservation.
- Comment agreeing that it is not in our purview and that is not what we are being asked to do.
- Comment that the Commission has done what was needed.
- Comment that only this building is agendized. Cari added that this structure is on the survey and not the others.
- Question about the rock walls, and the Chair indicated that would be part of it, because it was built when the house was built, but we can check that. That is one of the things Nancy talks about when she says that a little more research would be great, but for a lot of buildings in Sedona, it is difficult to find things about them. The County did not keep records.
- Comment that the County wasn't there until the '70s, and the descendents are now dying.
- Comment that we could talk with Laura Purtymun, who is the great-granddaughter and historian for the Sedona Historical Society.
- Comment that it would be interesting to invite her to the meeting, so it is on record.
- Suggestion that staff may want to get in contact with her and her name is Laura Purtymun Hyatt.
- Comment that her phone number can be provided to staff.
- Comment that it is a beautiful piece of property.
- Comment expressing the wish that it could be a park.
- Comment that if it were in Palm Springs, people would want to restore all of it.
- Comment that people are starting to want to do those things and Arizona is getting better at it and a lot better at archeology.

*Note: At this time, the group attempted to locate Commissioner Schudson and Councilor McIlroy.*

- Question as to if it is zoned for 19 units, and Cari indicated that is right.
- Comment that it seems like a reasonable amount. Cari pointed out what was considered as one unit, and then any other commercial uses that can fit in that, so it is like a Commercial zone with the ability to have 19 lodging units.
- Question as to if it has to be commercial, and Cari indicated yes; unless they get a Zone Change; that is what their development rights are now.

*Note: Commissioner Schudson and Councilor McIlroy rejoined the group at this time.*

- Question as to if this had some prosperous years with lots of vacationers, and the Chair indicated that a friend ran this and it did fairly well.
- Comment about being impressed by the variety of housing; you could have a big family reunion in some of the buildings and a quiet get-away for two in others.
- Question as to if it is still zoned to where that would be possible, and Cari indicated yes.
- Comment that it would be a hard call to say we needed to save the other buildings.

Cari Meyer asked if there were any other questions, and the Chair indicated that they were ready to depart. Commissioner Segner hasn't arrived yet, but she can email him. The history is here, but seeing the condition of the building was the most important thing and seeing its relationship to the landscape was important, because the Commission didn't know that.

- Question as to when a decision is supposed to be rendered. Cari indicated that she didn't know, but it is not today.
- Comment that the Commission may discuss that at the next meeting.
- Question as to whether or not the Commissioners should summarize their opinions.

*Note: Commissioner Segner joined the group at this time.*

Cari Meyer summarized that we need to look at where the house is in relation to the floodplain, how long it has been closed as a resort, and look at the ALTA survey from the previous project and

possibly the previous development plan. There is also a request that someone have access to the interior of the building and some more information on the rock walls, plus possibly inviting Laura Purtymun Hyatt to the Commission's meeting.

Chair Unger explained to Commissioner Segner that the Commission is concentrating on the Purtymun house. Commissioner Segner noted that he saw the house before and it has been added to a couple of times. Chair Unger added that the original surface was tin that looked like brick.

- Comment that since Commissioner Segner has a great eye for construction, it would be great for him to see it today and say if he sees other things.
- It was noted that the ditch is leaking.

Commissioners then walked around the house again with Commissioner Segner.

- Comment that we can't go inside, because of legal liability.
- Comment that it has been changed a lot; this has been added and the header has been added to support it, so this is way after the fact and it wasn't done very well either.
- Comment that it is still legitimately historic, because it is 50 years ago.
- Question as to what makes it not done very well, and Commissioner Segner explained that it hasn't been finished; they just did a header and the two are separating.
- Question as to if that is how they would have done it in those days, and Chair Unger indicated no, it was probably because the family did it.
- Question about the context of the period of time when it was done, and Commissioner Segner indicated that it is pretty crappy.
- Comment that it is "do it yourself" and part of the history is that it was the family that did it.
- Comment that it was done over 30 years and it was added onto, and there is no problem with that, it is very typical of what you might find in the '50s. If you were to hold this as an historic building compared to others, it is historic, but on a scale of one to 10, it would be a one.
- Comment that Commissioner Segner has always been on that side of this issue.
- Comment indicating that the little rock building in Uptown is an interesting building with an interesting history.
- Comment that the State was going to nominate this for a historic landmark, and the building may not be very appealing to us, but it is an argument to have later. Today, we are just here to see the context of the building and the site, so we are asking if it is in pretty good shape as far as not falling down now.
- Comment that it is not going to fall down; it is pieced together pretty well, and you have another whole interior wall inside of this, and then these headers put in afterwards to support this, so it is not falling down; it will be here 40 years from now.
- Comment that none of us have been inside.
- Comment that the foundation looks pretty stable.
- Comment that no wood rot was seen.
- Comment that there are no pressure cracks on the wall indicating that it is moving or sliding; it's just an overlay of the original building. The original building is holding everything, and then this is another structure holding it too, so there are two structures holding and it is not movable.
- Comment that it is poured on a foundation, because in the old days, they put rocks and did it on top of the rocks, and backfilled, so it is substantially built well, but not finished well.
- Comment that the next step is to have the discussion about what we will say to the landowners.
- Comment that part of the roughness gives it character and personality of the era; it wouldn't fit if it was polished masonry work.
- Comment in agreement, but you can't protect every building in town, so you try to find the best one for that period, and the rock work in Sedona is fairly famous, and there are a lot of different types for different eras. You can tell who did it, so the point is that this is homemade.
- Comment that again that is not for our argument today. Cari explained that the Commission is here, so when you discuss it in the future and you have an idea of what it is.
- Comment pointing out something that is very new.

- Question about the hotel occupancy rate in Sedona now, and Commissioner Segner indicated that annualized, it is probably about 68%. This month isn't good, because of the fire, etc. They were running almost 100% last month.

**3. Adjournment and return by carpool to City Hall.**

The Chair called for adjournment at approximately 10:05 a.m. without objection, so the Commission could return to City Hall.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the actions of the Historic Preservation Commission during the site visit held on June 23, 2014.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date